

There has been much success in this area. There have been numerous research programs that have been done not only at the Department of Energy facilities, but at universities around this country that have taken advantage of the ARPA-E program. It is modeled after the very successful and very long-lasting Department of Defense ARPA program, and it works. We've actually seen major scientific breakthroughs that have occurred as a result of the funding from the ARPA-E program.

Modest as it was, if this amendment were to be adopted, it would be a very big program, one that has the potential of advancing this Nation's future and freeing us—in the case of oil—from the petro dictators of the world and also, in the case of coal, from the extraordinary problems that coal brings to the environment and to communities throughout this Nation. I understand the coal industry and their desire to continue to dig for coal, but we know that at some point we're going to have to move away into the future, and that is what this amendment would attempt to accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. With all respect, I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate his comments about ARPA-E. I appreciate the purpose behind its creation. And I will certainly acknowledge that it would appear at ARPA-E there is a new culture, if you would, at that element of the Department of Energy to move projects along and to have a conclusion to research.

As I indicated in my opening remarks in general debate on this bill, I wish the Department of Energy had brought the same vigor and that same commitment that they had to ARPA-E to existing programs at the Department of Energy because my concern is that at some point in time we have too many programs that are going to solve the problem and we're tripping over each other.

At this point, we have 46 Energy Frontier Research Centers, and there is a request to add three to eight more. We have a new administration, and it is not unique to the Obama administration that at the Department of Energy we need, as I would characterize it, a new silver ball to chase around. We need new hubs so that people can talk to each other about critical research. At this point in time, there are three hubs in place, as I understand, for about 18 months. There are two more called for in this bill, totaling five.

We need a bioenergy research center. There are now three in the United States: one in Berkeley, California; one in Madison, Wisconsin; and one in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. We also need defined

research being done at the Joint Genome Institute that was established in 1997 under President Clinton.

I, at this point in time, would like to make sure that ARPA-E works over a longer term, as advertised, and that as advertised the Department takes that culture that is being developed at ARPA-E and to infuse it into these other programs and to show the Congress of the United States there is communication between these numerous programs before we provide any additional monies over and above those called for in the bill.

So again, very respectfully, I would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2120

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to oppose the amendment but also to associate myself with the ranking member's comments on ARPA-E, which I'm supportive of. Of course our colleague's amendment would add funding to ARPA-E, which receives some \$100 million in our bill; but the way he would do it would be virtually to eliminate funding for the Fossil Energy Research and Development program, I think causing excessive job losses. And I think the program makes major contributions.

Of course we can't forget that fossil fuels, coal, and natural gas generate about 70 percent of our Nation's electricity. ARPA-E may someday generate a much greater percentage than perhaps it potentially does today, but we're a long way from there. So I oppose the gentleman's amendment and certainly the source, using the Fossil Fuels account for this additional money, that he suggests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2354) making

appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2367. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Amendment To Allow Additional Exemptions [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0072; FV10-927-1 FIR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2368. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2011 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS-CN-10-0111; CN-11-001] (RIN: 0581-AD11) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2369. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Suspension of Handling Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0019; FV11-916/917-5 IR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2370. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increases Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0104; FV11-925-1 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2371. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0115; FV11-932-1 IR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2372. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0090; FV10-989-3 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.